



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,140	06/29/2001	Shari Gharavy	85160.923	5419

33438 7590 06/14/2005
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP
P.O. BOX 203518
AUSTIN, TX 78720

EXAMINER

SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,140

Applicant(s)

GHARAVY, SHARI

Examiner

Jonathan D. Schlaifer

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to an Amendment to Application 09/896,140 filed on 2/24/2005.
2. Claims 1-28 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 are independent claims.
Claims 1, 8, 15, 20, and 22 have been amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. **Claims 1-28 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hyman et al. (USPN 6,772,395 B1—filing date 2/1/2000), hereinafter Hyman.**
4. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Hyman discloses an extensible method for simplifying input provided to a computer program (Hyman discloses a data flow architecture that can modify and simplify data in the Abstract, lines 1-15) comprising: creating a framework for a first grammar level (in col. 4, lines 5-15, the use of schemas as frameworks in conjunction with the invention is disclosed); performing a first transformation of said framework to generate a first set of rules relating to interpretation of said first grammar level (transformation in conjunction with the schemas is inherently involved with the transformation described in col. 3, lines 20-35); performing a second transformation of said framework to generate a first presentation style for said first grammar level (transformation in conjunction with an XSL presentation style is described in col. 3, lines 20-35); obtaining a user defined input in said first grammar, said user defined input conforming to said first set of rules (Hyman describes a message bus in col. 3, lines 35-50, which obtains rule-based user input); and applying said first set of rules and said first presentation style to said user defined input to generate an output in a second grammar

understood by an application's parser (applying the rules and the presentation style occurs in the transformation described by col. 3, lines 20-35).

5. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Hyman describes a method wherein creating a framework comprises: creating one or more files having grammar definitions conforming to a second set of rules (this limitation corresponds with the XML schemas of col. 4, lines 5-15); and transforming said one or more files into said framework using a second presentation style conforming to said framework (using the XML schemas is described in conjunction with XSL transformation in col. 4, lines 5-15 and col. 3, lines 20-35).
6. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Hyman discloses in element 410 of Figure 4B a first transformation with an independent transformation style. Given the prior independent styles, this would be a third style.
7. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Hyman discloses in element 420 of Figure 4B a second transformation with an independent transformation style. Given the prior independent styles, this would be a fourth style.
8. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Hyman uses XML for the first grammar of said user defined input (col. 11, lines 5-15), and XML is extensible.
9. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Hyman discloses that the second grammar understood by said application's parser is that of XML and XSL, which is inherently fixed.
10. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Hyman discloses in col. 3, lines 20-35 that the data representation language is extensible markup language (XML).
11. **Regarding independent claim 8**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.

12. **Regarding dependent claim 9**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.
13. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.
14. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.
15. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.
16. **Regarding dependent claim 13**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 14**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.
18. **Regarding independent claim 15**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1, and is rejected under similar rationale.
19. **Regarding dependent claim 16**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2, and is rejected under similar rationale.
20. **Regarding dependent claim 17**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3, and is rejected under similar rationale.
21. **Regarding dependent claim 18**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4, and is rejected under similar rationale.
22. **Regarding dependent claim 19**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5, and is rejected under similar rationale.

Art Unit: 2178

23. **Regarding dependent claim 20**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6, and is rejected under similar rationale.
24. **Regarding dependent claim 21**, it is a computer readable medium that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7, and is rejected under similar rationale.
25. **Regarding independent claim 22**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 1 and is rejected under similar rationale.
26. **Regarding dependent claim 23**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.
27. **Regarding dependent claim 24**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 3 and is rejected under similar rationale.
28. **Regarding dependent claim 25**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 4 and is rejected under similar rationale.
29. **Regarding dependent claim 26**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 5 and is rejected under similar rationale.
30. **Regarding dependent claim 27**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 6 and is rejected under similar rationale.
31. **Regarding dependent claim 28**, it is a method that is functionally similar to the method of claim 7 and is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

32. Applicant's arguments filed 2/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

33. Applicant alleges that Hyman fails to teach “performing a first transformation of said framework to generate a first set of rules relating to interpretation of said first grammar level” and “performing a second transformation of said framework to generate a first presentation style for said first grammar level”. However, as noted in the Office Action, such disclosure is contained in col. 3 of Hyman. Hyman describes a self-modifying data flow architecture which reads on the present invention as claimed, and the Examiner maintains his rejection as set forth in the Office Action.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,928,323 (filing date 3/28/1997)—Gosling et al.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2178

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is 703-305-9777.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 703-308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER